

**RECEIVED**  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**APR 23 2007**Serial No. 09/904,686  
Page 6 of 8**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application. Claim 1-7 are amended herein, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the three accounting methods available and that at the outset of the method, the quantities of such accounting methods are displayed on the terminal device. Amendments to claims 2-7 are in accordance with the changes to claim 1. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 112, second paragraph rejection.

In the office action Claims 1, 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,303,297 to Hillis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,956 to Ehlers et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,853,990 to Thiel. Further, the office action rejects Claims 1-2 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillis in view of Ehlers et al. and Thiel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,754 to Kikuchi et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

It is believed that the rejections based on the cited references were as a result of a misunderstanding of the claimed invention as evidenced by the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, the Applicants request the Examiner review the arguments presented in the amendment filed on September 14, 2006, as it is submitted that arguments presented there are relevant to the newly amended claims, which merely clarify the bases for the arguments presented there to distinguishing the claimed present invention over the relied upon portions of the cited references.

84210949\_1

Serial No. 09/904,686

Page 7 of 8

With respect to Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the relied upon portions of Hillies, Ehlers and Thiel fail to teach or suggest a plurality of accounting methods (first to third accounting methods) that can be applied to a packet communication between a terminal device and a network. Moreover, the relied upon portions of these references fail to teach or suggest that with respect to the packet communication, accounting quantities corresponding to at least two accounting methods, each of which has a different accounting element (one of number of packets, quantity of packets and time of packet communication) are calculated at the terminal device and displayed during the packet communication, in parallel.

Still further, in one aspect of the present invention, after finishing the packet communication, a subscriber can determine one of accounting methods to be applied to the packet communication through referencing the displayed accounting quantities corresponding to the accounting methods selected on a starting time of the packet communication. Therefore, the subscriber can select a proper accounting method in response to conditions of the packet communication. It is submitted that the relied upon portions of the cited references fail to teach or suggest that "after finishing the packet communication, selecting, as an accounting method to be applied to the packet communication, one of said at least two accounting methods, based on the displayed accounting quantities."

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of the cited references and is allowable. That is, the combination of Hillis, Ehlers, Thiel, and Kikuchi fail either singularly or in combination to teach each and every aspect of the instant invention. Therefore independent claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-7 which depend from independent claim 1 are allowable therewith.

84210949\_1

Serial No. 09/904,686


Page 8 of 8

The above statements on the disclosures in the cited reference represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney. The Examiner is respectfully requested to specifically indicate those portions of the reference that provide the basis for a view contrary to any of the above-stated opinions.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathan Weber  
Reg. No. 50,958

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304  
Telephone: (212) 940-8564  
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987  
Docket No.: FUJY 18.847 (100794-09747)  
NDW:cc

84210949\_1